Appl. No. 09/967,010 Amdt. dated February 28, 2007 Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 12-22 are pending. In the Office Action mailed September 29, 2006, claims 12-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103 in as being unpatentable over Lowery (U.S. Patent No. 5,894,554) in view of Hayashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,488). The independent claims have been amended. It is asserted that the claims, as amended, are patentably distinguishable over the references of record. Further examination and reconsideration of the application are requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Lowery discloses all of the claimed features for creating an integrated user interface, except for assigning the copy function and creating an integrated user interface having the copy function, and transmitting the integrated user interface to the client. The Examiner cited Hayashi for these functions.

The present invention relates to providing an integrated Web page from a plurality of Web service pages with copying of data items shared between the pages (see, e.g., page 2, lines 20-25 and page 3, lines 16-24). In one implementation, a user interface integration apparatus 10 (Figure 1) creates an integrated page having a copy function for copying common data items shared by a plurality of Web services pages. The integrated page is transmitted to a Web browser that requested the page (see page 5, lines 15-25).

An integrated page is created in response to receiving a request from a client browser for an integrated page that requests information from each of multiple servers in accordance with configuration page data that specifies the pages that will be fetched for the integrated page. For example, Figure 2 shows an Integrated Page Configuration table 300 that specifies page configuration 302 and copy data 303 for integrated pages 301. Figure 3 shows the Configuration Page table 310 for each integrated page of Figure 2. The table 310 lists the pages 311 that will be fetched and combined for the integrated page. Figure 4 shows the Copy Data table 320 that lists common data items 321 for each integrated page of Figure 2. Each entry in the table 320 provides a common item ID, a page specification, a data field, and an IN/OUT indication for the data

It is asserted that the proposed combination of Lowery and Hayashi in the Office Action does not support the prima facie case for obviousness with respect to the amended claims. Appl. No. 09/967,010 Amdt. dated February 28, 2007 Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2006

First, under M.P.E.P. § 2143, obviousness requires a suggestion or motivation for combining the Lowery and Hayashi references. There is no such suggestion or motivation, because Lowery relates to generating Web pages for a browser (col. 2, lines 20-35), whereas Hayashi relates to generating a program for intelligent information retrieval in response to queries (col. 2, lines 15-19). There also is no reasonable expectation of success for the combination (the second criterion required under M.P.E.P. § 2143 for obviousness), because Lowery generates pages for a browser (i.e., a pre-existing program), whereas Hayashi generates a program. Lastly, the proposed combination of Lowery and Hayashi would not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 12-22.

All of the pending independent claims refer to acting upon a request for an integrated page. Claim 1 is illustrative:

upon a request from the client that specifies an integrated page, requesting information from each of the servers providing the user interface information in accordance with configuration page data that specifies pages to be fetched for the integrated page.

This feature is described in the specification. See, for example, the pending application at page 11, lines 25 through page 12, line 9, and Figure 12.

The page requests handled by Lowery do not request <u>integrated pages</u> that are <u>specified in accordance with configuration page data</u> that specifies <u>pages to be fetched</u> for the integrated page. The program generated by Hayashi has nothing to do with integrated pages. Therefore, no combination of the references could provide the claimed invention recited in the independent claims (claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 22).

Another claim limitation not provided by the proposed combination relates to the copy function. All of the independent claims also refer to assigning a copy function for copying common data from the fetched pages according to user interface information, for copying common data items shared by the fetched pages. Again, taking claim 1 for example:

assigning a copy function for copying common data from the fetched pages according to the user interface information to thereby create an integrated user interface as a single integrated page consisting of the user interface Appl. No. 09/967,010 Amdt. dated February 28, 2007 Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2006

> information from the servers and the integrated user interface having copy function for copying common data items shared by the fetched pages.

This feature is described in the specification; see, for example, page 7, line 9 through page 9, line 9 and page 10, line 1 through page 11, line 24.

The page requests handled by Lowery do not relate to a copy function <u>for copying common data from the fetched pages according to the user interface information</u> to thereby create an integrated page, and do not result in an integrated page with a copy function <u>for copying common data items shared by the fetched pages</u>. Thus, no combination of the references could provide the claimed invention recited in the independent claims (claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 22).

For at least these reasons, the proposed combination of Lowery and Hayashi does not render obvious the independent claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, nor does it render obvious the claims dependent therefrom (claims 16-21). The remaining references have been reviewed and do not make up for the deficiencies of Lowery and Hayashi.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims 12-22 now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 32,233

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 858-350-6100 Fax: 415-576-0300 Attachments DAH-dah

60993647 v1